

February 5, 2004

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

TM 5272RPL², Log 01-02-060; Valley View Estates

2. Description of Project:

The proposed project is the subdivision of 27.58 acres into 11 single-family residential parcels ranging in size from 2.01 to 4.56 net acres. The property is zoned A70, Limited Agriculture, which requires the maintenance of a 2-acre parcel size. The project will be accessed from Wilhite Lane. Water will be provided by the Valley Center Municipal Water District and fire service will be provided by the Valley Center Fire Protection District. All lots will be served by an on-site sewer system.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

David Davis
501 W. Broadway, Plaza A-245
San Diego, California 92101

4. Project Location:

The project is located on the east side of Wilhite Lane in the community of Valley Center in an unincorporated area of the County of San Diego, APN 185-150-02, 188-150-03, & 188-150-04.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1070, Grid G5

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The surrounding land uses of the project include agricultural and residential uses to the east, west and south and rural residential uses to the west. The elevation on the property ranges from approximately 1,600 feet to 1,800 feet and the site

slopes to the west. The project site contains an existing building, which is to be removed. An active citrus grove covers the remainder of the site.

6. General Plan Designation
Community Plan: Valley Center
Land Use Designation: (17) Estate Development Area
Density: 1 du/2, 4 acres
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A70-Limited Agriculture
Density: 1 du/2 acres
Special Area Regulation: None
8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Land Use and Planning (includes Community Character)
Biological Resources
Aesthetics (includes Landform Modification)
Agricultural Resources
Mandatory Findings of Significance

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Daniella Rosenberg (858) 694-3016

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Execution of Indefinite Offer to Dedicate Right-of-Way	County of San Diego
Streambed Alteration Agreement	Calif. Dept. of Fish and Game (CDFG)
Clean Water Act - Section 404 Permit	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

401 Permit - Water Quality Certification Regional Water Quality Control
Improvement Plans Board (RWQCB)
County of San Diego

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

Department of Conservation

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Daniella Rosenberg, Project Analyst, Department of Planning and Land Use
Sami Raya, Project Manager, Department of Planning and Land Use
Ed Sinsay, Project Engineer, Department of Public Works
REC Consultants, Inc., Biological Consultant
Masson and Associates, Consulting Engineer

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduces the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

DANIELLA ROSENBERG, Environmental Planner
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Resource Planning

Date: February 5, 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: February 5, 2004

PROJECT NAME: Valley View Estates

PROJECT NUMBER(S): TM 5272RPL², Log No. 01-02-060

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

No.

The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 2.4 Non-Urban Residential and General Plan Land Use Designation (17) Estate Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel

sizes of 2 acres where the average slope of a parcel is less than 25 percent and 4 acres where the average slope of a parcel is greater than 25 percent. Lots 1-6 and 8-11 have an average slope of less than 25 percent and each measure greater than 2 acres. Lot 7 has an average slope greater than 25 percent and measures greater than 4 acres. Therefore the proposed project has gross parcel sizes consistent with the General Plan.

The project is subject to the policies of the Valley Center Community Plan. The Community Character Goal encourages the preservation and maintenance of the overall rural and agricultural character of the estate residential development area. The project is consistent with this goal because the project avoids a monotonous tract development by creating large lots and scattered building pads.

The Residential Goal of the Community Plan encourages the preservation and enhancement of the rural atmosphere of the Valley Center Planning Area. The project is consistent with this goal because the on-site wetlands will be preserved via an open space easement and because the Preliminary Grading Plan has demonstrated that the development of the project will not require extensive or severe grading. Furthermore, the project is consistent with the Residential Goal because the grading for the proposed road will follow the existing topography, grading required for the creation of building pads is not extensive, and because sensitive natural features of the site will be preserved via an open space easement.

The Agricultural Goal encourages the preservation and enhancement of existing and future agricultural uses in the Valley Center Community Plan. The project is consistent with this goal because the Agricultural Analysis dated September 24, 2002 concluded that the project will not have an adverse impact on existing agricultural uses.

The Circulation Element Goal of the Community Plan is to develop a circulation system which will preserve the rural character of the community and provide a safe, balanced transportation system which can accommodate all modes of traffic needed by the community. The project is consistent with this goal because the amount of traffic generated from the subdivision will not reduce the level of service for Miller Road and Cole Grade Road, it will not result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety, and will not result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists.

The Conservation Goal of the Community Plan encourages the preservation of natural and cultural resources, sensitive vegetation, and watercourses and encourages the minimization of erosion. The project is consistent with this goal because the Biological Report dated April 2003 has demonstrated that all sensitive resources will be preserved via an open space easement. Furthermore, a Hydrology Study dated May 6, 2003, and a Stormwater Management Plan dated January 16, 2004, have demonstrated that the project will not result in increased erosion, siltation, or damage to downstream properties.

The proposed project is consistent with the policies of the Valley Center Community Plan.

The current zone is A70, Limited Agriculture Use Regulation which requires a net minimum lot size of 2 acres. The project is proposing parcel sizes greater than 2 acres, therefore the proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed use will not have a harmful effect on the neighborhood character because the area surrounding the project site is developed with residential and agricultural uses. The parcels to the north and west of the project site are developed with single-family residences on parcel sizes that range from 2 to 10 acres. The parcels to the south and east of the project site are within an agricultural preserve and range in size from 9 to 45 acres. The proposed project is for a residential land use proposing a density of .42 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, this project will be

compatible with the existing character of development and planned land use.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is a major subdivision which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site contains Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance. However, only 36 percent of the parcel will be converted to a non-agricultural use. The remainder of the site will remain as a citrus grove. Based on the California Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (LESA) detailed in the Agricultural Analysis prepared by CIC Research, Inc. dated September 24, 2002, the proposed development of eleven residential lots on 27.58 acres is not considered a significant impact on agriculture. The LESA model includes an analysis of the soil resource quality, project size, water resource availability, and surrounding agricultural and protected resource lands. In addition, the project site is surrounded by residential uses to the north and the west. Therefore, this project would result in infilling and a significant conversion of farmland resources to non-agricultural use would not occur.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site and surrounding area contain agriculture. However, the proposed use does not propose to significantly alter the project site's agricultural uses, orange groves, to non-agricultural uses. Only 36 percent of the parcel will be converted to a non-agricultural use. The proposed project is for the development of 11 residential units. Existing agricultural uses will remain on the project site. From the results of the LESA model it can be determined that this project will not have a significant impact on agricultural resources. Additionally, the project site is zoned A70, Limited Agriculture, and both residential and agricultural uses are permitted in this zone. The project site is not located within a Williamson Act Contract and no conflicts will occur with any other contracts. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project site and surrounding area contain agriculture uses. However, the proposed use does not propose to significantly alter the project site's agricultural uses, orange groves, to non-agricultural uses. The proposed project is for the development of eleven residential units on 27.58 acres of land. The remaining 64 percent of land will continue to be used for agriculture. The existing agricultural uses will remain as the dominant use on the project site and this project will not result in the conversion of agricultural lands. According to Agricultural Analysis prepared by CIC Research, Inc. dated September 24, 2002, the proposed development is not considered a significant impact on agriculture. The project area is a mixture of residential and agricultural uses. Adjacent properties to the west are residential homes with horses. Properties to the north include residential, agriculture, and open space. The properties adjacent to the south are agricultural with some fallow land. Therefore, the proposed project will not have a significant impact involving changes in the existing environment, which would result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not displace residential uses but will result in a net gain of housing potential.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as FaD2, Fallbrook sandy loam, 9 to 15 percent slopes, FaE2, Fallbrook Sandy loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes, CnG2, Cienega-Fallbrook rocky sandy loams, 30 to 65 percent slopes, FaC2, Fallbrook sandy loam, FaC, Fallbrook sandy loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes. The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns;

is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified no soils on the site which have a HIGH shrink-swell behavior. All mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior. Therefore, on-site soil conditions are stable and do not have adverse potential for development activity.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996).

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Not Applicable.

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that is impaired for Coliform bacteria and nutrients. According to the Stormwater Management Plan prepared July 17, 2003, there are no impaired water bodies associated with this project.

The project proposes the subdivision of an existing orchard into eleven lots for residential development, which could contribute the following pollutants: sediment, nutrients from fertilizers, trash and debris, hydrocarbons, and pesticides from landscaping. However, according to the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Masson and Associates, Inc. dated July 17, 2003, the following BMPs will be employed as required by the WPO:

Site Design: The project has been design to minimize impervious area; slopes will be stabilized with landscaping; rip-rap will be placed storm drain outfalls to reduce velocities.

Source Control: Homeowners will receive educational brochures from the Department of Environmental Health and storm drain inlets will be stenciled with a message warning citizens not to dump pollutants into the drain.

Potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Service Availability Letter from the local water district has been provided indicating adequate water resources and infrastructure to provide requested water resources.

4. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. A Preliminary Hydrology Study dated has been prepared by Masson & Associates that addresses drainage and erosion impacts. Due to the minor increase in discharge from the site and the inadequacies of the existing culverts, the existing pipes will be replaced with new 42 inches HDPE. Therefore, according to the study, the project will not cause existing drainage patterns to be significantly altered and no additional erosion will occur on-site or off-site due to the project.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. A Preliminary Hydrology Study dated has been prepared by Masson & Associates that addresses drainage and erosion impacts. Due to the minor increase in discharge from the site and the inadequacies of the existing culverts, the existing pipes will be replaced with new 42 inches HDPE. Therefore, according to the study, the project will not cause existing drainage patterns to be significantly altered and no additional erosion will occur on-site or off-site due to the project.

6. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not substantially increase the amount of existing drainage from the site and project area which would exceed the capacity of existing

or planned storm water drainage systems. A Preliminary Hydrology Study and a Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) have been prepared by Masson & Associates that address drainage, storm water, and maintenance. Two downstream culverts crossing private roads (one crossing Wilhite Lane at the southwest corner of the project; and one crossing "Via Valencia" 330 feet southerly of the project) are required to be improved to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Therefore, the project will not exceed the capacity of Stormwater drainage systems.

7. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Water quality objectives have been designated for waters of the San Diego Region by the Regional Water Quality Control Board as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea (3.12), within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; industrial service supply; freshwater replenishment; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the subdivision of an existing orchard into eleven lots for residential development, which could contribute the following pollutants: sediment, nutrients from fertilizers, trash and debris, hydrocarbons, and pesticides from landscaping. However, according to the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Masson and Associates, Inc. dated July 17, 2003, the following BMPs will be employed as required by the WPO:

Site Design: The project has been design to minimize impervious area; slopes will be stabilized with landscaping; rip-rap will be placed storm drain outfalls to reduce velocities.

Source Control: Homeowners will receive educational brochures from the Department of Environmental Health and storm drain inlets will be stenciled with a message warning citizens not to dump pollutants into the drain.

These BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

8. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A Preliminary Hydrology Study and a Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP) have been prepared by Masson & Associates that address drainage and Stormwater systems. Two downstream culverts crossing private roads (one crossing Wilhite Lane at the southwest corner of the project; and one crossing "Via Valencia" 330 feet southerly of the project) are required to be improved to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works. Therefore, the project will not exceed the capacity of Stormwater drainage systems. In addition, the project will not cause existing drainage patterns to be significantly altered and no additional erosion will occur on-site or off-site due to the project. Therefore, the project will not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

9. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will obtain its water supply from the Valley Center Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

10. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply, and will therefore not deplete groundwater supplies. In addition, groundwater recharge is not listed as a beneficial use for water resources in the Bonsall Hydrologic Subarea 903.12.

Therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge that would result in a net deficit aquifer volume or lowering of the local groundwater table.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 132 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Based on a site visit conducted on August 21, 2003 by Daniella Rosenberg, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact.

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposal will add approximately 132 ADTs on Cole Grade Road (SA 120), which is shown on the Circulation Element of the General Plan as a Collector Road. There are approximately 10,000 ADTs on this portion of Cole Grade Road. As currently improved Cole Grade Road can currently handle 10,900 ADTs at Level of Service "D". The additional 132 ADTs will not cause a threshold impact. As a future Collector Road Cole Grade Road (SC 320) can handle 13,700 ADTs at Level of Service "A". The additional 132 ADTs are not considered a significant impact.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not have any significant impacts on traffic safety. The project will be certified, by the private engineer, that it has adequate sight distance prior to final occupancy and that all driveways are built to County Standards. The applicant will be required to design and construct all private roads per the County Private Road Standards.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on any County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The site contains 26.84 acres of citrus trees, 0.27 acres of disturbed wetland, and 0.48 acres of developed habitat. The Biological Technical Report prepared by REC Consultants dated April 2003, states that impacts to approximately 0.13 acre of disturbed wetlands will occur as a result of the proposed project, which would result in a significant impact. According to the report, disturbed wetland is considered a sensitive habitat. Disturbed wetlands are protected with the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) as environmentally sensitive lands. Wetland impacts will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio (1:1 creation and 2:1 restoration or enhancement). Therefore, mitigation requirements will be met through the creation, enhancement, restoration, and preservation of 0.39 acre of disturbed wetland. The remaining 0.14 acre of disturbed wetland will be included in the 1.35 acres that will be placed in designated open space prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Final Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur. The open space easement includes the drainage on-site as well as a 25-foot buffer from the edge of the drainage, as shown on the Open Space Easement Map dated January 5, 2004.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The site contains a drainage that traverses the site from the north boundary in a southwesterly direction. This drainage, according to the Biological Technical Report prepared by REC Consultants dated April 2003, qualifies as disturbed wetland habitat. As a result of the proposed project, 0.13 acres of disturbed wetland will occur, requiring permits from the California Department of Fish and Game, Army Corp of Engineers, and Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wetland impacts will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio (1:1 creation and 2:1 restoration or enhancement). Therefore, mitigation requirements will be met through the creation, enhancement, restoration, and preservation of 0.39 acres of disturbed wetland. The remaining 0.14 acre of disturbed wetland will be included in the 1.35 acres that will be placed in designated open space prior to issuance of improvement or grading plans or prior to recordation of the Final Map, whichever comes first, and therefore no significant impact will occur. The open space easement includes the drainage on-site as well as a 25-foot buffer from the edge of the drainage, as shown on the Open Space Easement Map dated January 5, 2004. Therefore, there will be no net loss of wetlands and therefore no significant impact will occur.

3. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated.

The project site contains a drainage that traverses the site from the north boundary in a southwesterly direction which if impacted will cause significant alterations to wetland habitats that have been identified by REC Consultants in the Biological Technical Report dated April 2003 as California Department of Fish and Game and Army Corps of Engineer jurisdiction wetlands. As a result of the potential impacts to wetlands, the applicant must provide a formal letter from the California Department of Fish and Game and Army Corps of Engineers to the County of San Diego that a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" or 404 Permit has been obtained **OR** a formal letter from these agencies stating the proposed project will not require specific agreements or permits.

4. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Less Than Significant Impact.

According to the Biological Technical Report prepared by REC Consultants dated April 2003, it is unlikely that the site serves as a wildlife dispersal corridor due to the long-term use of the site for agriculture and lack of native vegetation. Therefore, impacts to the orchard, disturbed wetlands and developed area on-site would not impact wildlife dispersal corridors.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Not Applicable.

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire

protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map, Tentative Parcel Map, or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter has been received from the Valley Center Fire Protection District.

4. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not expose people or property to flooding, as it will not substantially alter the existing drainage of the site or area, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. A CEQA level Hydrology Study has been prepared by Masson & Associates that addresses drainage and flooding and the Department of Public Works (DPW) has accepted this study.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Although the project may be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, the project is not intended for commercial or industrial use and does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Not Applicable.

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (one mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not generate potentially significant adverse groundborne vibration or noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Excluding ground vibration from motor vehicles, trains, aircraft, or temporary construction, groundborne noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit.

3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Project implementation is not expected to expose existing noise sensitive areas to noise 10 decibels CNEL over existing ambient noise levels.

4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project would not generate a substantial temporary or periodic increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

For general construction, the temporary increase over existing ambient levels is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County Noise Ordinance. The hours of construction are also restricted by the County Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410).

For project-related traffic, the temporary or periodic increase in noise levels going to and from the project site is not expected to exceed the 60 decibel CNEL limit of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan.

5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working in the project area to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the 60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed allowed use does not generate any potentially significant noise levels based on a staff review of the project.

6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact.

Project implementation is not expected to expose people living and working at the project site to excessive noise levels, because the County Geographic Mapping Application shows that the project lies outside of the 60-decibel CNEL noise contour of the airport and its proposed use would not generate any excessive noise levels based on a staff review of the project.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District, Valley Center Fire Protection District, and the Valley Center Municipal Water District. The service letters are based on the project's ability to meet the requirements set by these agencies.

The Valley Center-Pauma Unified School District states that the project is located entirely within the district and is eligible for service.

The Valley Center Fire Protection District states that the project is in the district and is eligible for service. The district indicates that based on the capacity and capability of the district's existing and planned facilities, fire protection facilities are currently adequate or will be adequate to serve the proposed project. The expected emergency travel time to the proposed project is seven to eight minutes which is less than the ten minute travel time anticipated in the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan.

The Valley Center Municipal Water District indicates that the project is in the district and that facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plans of the district.

The project is accessed by a proposed private road from Wilhite Lane, an existing private road; therefore, emergency access is adequate.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;

Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not result in the need for significant new distribution systems or substantial alterations to existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the proposed project. The Valley Center Municipal Water District will provide water and on-site sewage disposal systems will provide sewer. See Section X for specific details on availability and/or conditions.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project is not situated within a scenic vista or in close proximity to a scenic highway.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform. The project site has an existing average slope of less than 15.8 percent gradient. The Preliminary Grading Plan dated January 31, 2003 illustrates that minor grading is proposed for the creation of the proposed private road, building pads, and private drives. The plan indicates that 35,462 cubic yards of cut and 28,513 cubic yards of fill will be required to be graded. Slope heights of the proposed pads for Lots 1-6 and 8-11 will measure less than 15 feet in height and the slope heights for Lot 7 will not exceed 25 feet in height. The grading for the proposed pads will only be partially visible from Wilhite Lane. Therefore, the resultant development will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact.

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
 - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
 - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
 - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
 - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Less Than Significant Impact.

The project has been field inspected by a County certified archaeologist, Sue A. Wade, who has made the determination that the property contains no artifacts, archaeological features, or buried archaeological deposits. According the Cultural Resources Survey prepared by Sue Wade with Heritage Resources, there will be no impacts related to cultural resources from the development of the project property.

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., and 4., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Questions 1., and 2., the project will not degrade the quality of the environment and will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact.

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV, Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: None.
3. Mitigation measures: None

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b,
Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through
36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and
Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426,
County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300
through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of
Title 2 of the Government Code

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology